

HAB meeting of 3-2-06 notes

Board member Tilos opened the meeting at 7:02pm

Board member Lynch would like last paragraph removed.

Iverson correction w/ p. 7

Staff requests Item 4 be taken first

Report 4

Emily Pudell reviewed staff report as presented. Staff is seeking comments on proposed plans. No action will be taken tonight.

Tilos opened the public hearing.

Chris Buckley AAPS submitted approves with restoring building to historic. Presented 1979 photo and compared with 1979 picture. Reviewed letter submitted to HAB. Side entry reconstruction of the side entry. Inconsistency in plans. Does not show original stairway and existing historic store fronts What is new and what is existing, not called out in the plans.

Dick Rutter – AAPS- continued with AAPS comments and concerns. People need to keep in mind that people like the Station neighborhoods. All of the retail façade have been altered except this one. Shows character of what it looked like many years ago. Need to keep storefront. Detail of center door should remain. Two visible facades should remain. Came across the bay in the 1880's. shingles are important due to 1908 modernization. Not concerned with rear elevation. Building that should be restored to what it was like in the 1979 photo.

Owner of 478 Central. Brought an article that was written in the Journal on 10/22/93 which talks about 5th street station. One of the oldest structures still surviving. Read history of building as stated in article. Building has changes little over the years. Arch opening once led to the waiting room of train station. As a neighbor she has been concerned about preserving certain elements for her tenants. Some concerns have been that Mr. Wong has started construction in 2004 when he purchased the property. Demo without permits,. He jacked up a rear cottage on property which collapsed. Submitted photos of cottage for the Board. Made a complaint of unauthorized demo in 2004. Work continued without permits. Disrupted her tenants. When demo started she took photos which she submitted to Board. Concerned with rear and side elevations. Concerns with amount of debris left from collapses cottage. Submitted article and photos and complaint filed.

Ms. Eliason stated that the owner and property owner and George Carder are present to answer any questions.

Tilos closed the public hearing.

City shapers Richard Bottleoff for the owner Mr. Wong. Photos will help them reconstruct what was there before. They review AAPS letter and feels that their comments are reasonable. Thanks for comments.

Mr. Tilos asked about demo w/o permits. Arch does not know the history prior to them taking on the job.

Mr. Tilos asked if the owner is willing to restore to original.

Mr. Jensen, planner stated that they are here to get comments from this Board and Staff to help them restore. The plan that was submitted is first draft

Lynch stated that it is critical that this building is restored quickly. Would like the storefronts left as it. Has questions with windows that they would leak made her lose confidence in the whole thing.

Arch stated that these are working drawings. This is why they are here to hear comments from staff. Board and public.

Lynch would like it to look like it was originally. Today is the first time seeing the photos. Proposed plans are what Mr. Wong had proposed.

Iverson confirmed that now that they have this information the drawings will be amended to match the front façade.

Jensen stated that yes,

Iverson asked how arch would handle where large pieces have been removed.

Jensen stated that as long as they have documentation of what was original they can restore it.

Tilos stated he appreciates the arch being so open.

Eliason stated that this will not come before this Board again. It will go to the design review process approved at Staff level, with this Boards comments.

Pudell stated that the purpose of this meeting is to bring these plans before this Board for their comments that would help staff in specific aspects that they would like to see restored.

Lynch does not feel that they have had enough time to review the plans. What they are looking at is not the final plans. Does not agree with this process.

Pudell stated that staff will be proceeding with design review process after tonight.

Eliason stated that if applicant agrees it can bring back plans to the Board

Cathy stated that the applicants can consult with Mr. Buckley about details. Staff does here what this Board has to say about restoring to original. Concerns with delaying the project.

Applciant stated that they would like to move forward with this project.

Lynch stated that she would like the chair to be able to comment on this application.

Comments are

Leave storefront as is;.

Concerns with windows leaking.

Iverson stated that they would like this restored to the 1979 photo. Hoping that they could revisit.

M/S to continue to April (Lynch, Iverson) 3-0-2

Item 1

Stefani Hom reviewed staff report as presented. Staff recommends the Board approve the Certificate of Approval with conditions as stated in draft Reso.

Mr. Tilos asked for introduction of Cathy and Stefanie

Tilos opened public hearing

Don Osterhoud, owner, stated that the demo which was not approved is not a change of the charater of the house. Walls which were demolished have always planned to be reconstructed. Miscommunication with contractor and building inspector back in November. Stucco will match the rest of the house. Retain the original structure in front of the house. Does not appreciate the cities calculation of 30%. Trying to proceed in good faith. It was brought to the cities attention that there was more demolition than originally planned. He stated that there was miscommunication

Lynch confirmed that the front façade will be kept as it is. Answer is yes.

Mr. Wong, architect, spoke brought photo of existing house. Intention was to always preserve the front of the house. Impracticable from construction standpoint to retain the walls due to new foundation.

Public hearing is closed.

Lynch stated that she went to property and it is not on study list. Maybe we need to rethink the study list because the neighbor was on the list.

M/S (Iverson,Lynch) to approve as stated in Reso

Item 2

Stefani Hom reviewed staff report as presented. Reviewed history of building. Staff recommends approval of C of A with conditions as stated in draft Reso.

Tilos opened the public hearing.

Mr.Deleo, 33 year resident and spoke in favor of restoration. Relative to 30 % value most in interior and the exterior is only on the left rear and does not feel that it affects the historical character of the house.

Scott Brady, architct, is here to answer questions. Would like to clarify that the demolitions that are proposed in the rear, are additions, not original.

Lynch appreciates the way the packet was presented. So much mateial helps them make their decision. Questions about 2nd unit addition in the rear of property. Brady stated that it is going from small two room cottage, to a small one bedroom.

Tilos asked if there was a way to determin 30 % up front instead of during the demo process.

Eliason stated that they hope to rectify this soon, with revisions to the Historical Preservation Ordinance.which will be brought to the next meeting.

Public hearing closed.

M/S to approve (Lynch, Iverson) with conditions. 3-0-2.

Item 3

Emily presented the staff report. This is not on building study list and staff was not able to find anything to indicate it's historical significance. Reviewed plans with the Board called out windows that staff will be requiring applicant to ensure that new wood windows would be used to match the oringinal as a condition of approval. Staff is recommending approval

Chair Tilos opened the public hearing

Chris Buckley not representing an organization, stated that this building has been through a lot. Plans are inconsistent. Ongoing problem the floor plan on 2nd level what is

being proposed. Feels that this building has craftsman elements, not colonial revival as staff report states. Try to encourage applicant to go that route as a craftsman.

Public hearing is closed.

Iverson does not feel that the bay window does not have any historic style. As well as the columns on either side of the door does not have any historical style.

Lynch has questions with handrails.

Emily stated that the Design review issues are not complete. Staff has addressed the Boards comment in a letter previously sent to the applicant. No response as of yet.

Lynch feels that the proposed design is an improvement. Wants to make sure that as a condition, the Oak tree will be protected.

A condition of this approval is that the Oak tree is preserved.

Tilos would like this Board to concentrate on only the 30 % demo. Feels what is proposed looks good. Should not be concerned with the design review.

Eliason stated that this Boards comments will be considered in the Design Review

M/S (Lynch, Iverson) to approve with condition as stated in draft reso,.

Report 5.

Staff would like this item to be continued to the April meeting to allow staff to look at ways to make it easier for the Planners to determine when C of A is necessary, and the penalty section to prevent going over the scope of work

M/S to continue (Iverson,Lynch) to continue to April.

Oral Communications

Lynch staff as her guests to Historical Museum for their lecture series.

Lynch asked about comments regarding Posey Tube that were given in Sept to Caltrans Staff will follow up.

Staff communications

Work shop info with discusses conferences provided to the Board. Info to the Annual preservation conference. One course a year.

M/S tp adjourn at 8:30 pm

